

# COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE USE OF INTERNAL MEASURES FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES IN SOUTH EAST NIGERIA

*Rev. Fr. Ofojebe, W. N., PhD*

*Nwogbo, V. N., PhD*

*Anachuna, Obinna, Nonso, M.Ed*

Department of Educational Management and Policy, Faculty of Education,  
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra State,- Nigeria

---

## Abstract

The seeming decline in the quality of university education in Nigeria necessitated this study on the comparative analysis of the internal measures that are used in public and private universities in south east geo-political zone of Nigeria for quality assurance. The study adopted the descriptive survey research design. Three research questions and three hypotheses guided the study. The population of the study comprised 29,083 made up of 7,444 lecturers and 21,639 students admitted in the 2011/2012 academic session in the 74 faculties and 413 departments of the 13 universities (five public and eight private) in the south-east geo political zone, Nigeria. The sample of the study comprised 2,106 respondents which were made up of 936 lecturers and 1, 170 students from four universities sampled. The sample was composed through multi-stage sampling technique. Questionnaire developed by the researchers titled “Students’ Questionnaire on Internal Measures for Quality Assurance” (SQIMFQA) and “Lecturers’ Questionnaire on Internal Measures for Quality Assurance” (LQIMFQA).was the instrument used for data collection. The instrument was validated by three experts, one in Educational measurement and evaluation and the others in Educational planning from the departments of Educational foundations and Educational Management and Policy all in the faculty of Education Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka. The Cronbach’s alpha method was used to determine the internal consistency of the items and this yielded a result of 0.74. The researcher with the help of eight research assistants distributed and successfully collected all the 2,106 copies of the questionnaire administered. The research questions were analyzed using the mean, while the hypotheses were tested using z-test at 0.05 level of

significance. It was found among others that internal measures for quality assurance of student intake measures, evaluation of students' learning experience and teacher quality measures were not adequately used in both public and private universities in the south-east geo-political zone of Nigeria for quality assurance. Based on the findings, recommendations were made.

---

**Keywords:** Measures, Comparative Analysis and Quality Assurance

## **Introduction**

The decline in the quality of Nigeria's university education can be deduced from the current status of web metric world ranking of universities. According to the web metric rankings (2014), there is no Nigerian University (public or private) among the first 24 universities in Africa and among the first 1, 600(one thousand, six hundred) in the world. There is no university (public or private) in the south east geopolitical zone of Nigeria listed among the first 70 in the 2014African ranking of universities. The first ranked Nigeria public university occupies 25th, while the first ranked Nigerian private university in the African rankings of universities occupies the 94th position out of the first 100 in Africa (web metric University rankings, 2014).

In as much as one cannot be absolute about the quality implied in the world university ranking, it however does show a trend of relative qualities among countries. From the rankings, it is obvious that the quality of university education in Nigeria is on the decline. The scenario appears worrisome when viewed against the background that Nigeria once served as the hub of university education in the West-African sub-region, and indeed in Africa as a whole; and also from the standpoint of the rationale behind the establishment of university education in Nigeria among which is to maintain quality. Igbogbor (2012) maintained that certificates obtained in Nigeria are now subjected to further tests outside the country and further emphasized that the educated and the wealthy Nigerians now send their children to other African countries to get what they adjudge to be better education. This tends to negate the tenets of university education which is essentially an organisation established to produce quality workforce for national development. The provision of the much needed manpower to accelerate the growth and development of the economy has been said to be the main relevance of university education in Nigeria (Ibukun, 1997). The goals of tertiary education in Nigeria were aptly spelt out by the Federal Government of Nigeria in the National Policy on Education (2009, p38) as follows, to:

- a. contribute to national development through high level manpower training.

- b. develop and inculcate proper values for the survival of the individual and society.
- c. develop the intellectual capability of individual to understand and appreciate their local and external environments.
- d. acquire physical, intellectual, technical and professional skills, which will enable the individuals to be self-reliant and useful members of the society.
- e. promote and encourage scholarship, entrepreneurship and community service.
- f. forge and cement national unity; and
- g. promote national and international understanding and interaction”

It is in recognition of this that the Nigeria government commits immense resources to ensure the provision of university education for its citizens and also tailored their policies towards ensuring that education is made accessible to the generality of its citizenry. Since the inception of university education in Nigeria in 1955 with only one university (University of Nigeria, Nsukka), and its formal opening on 7th October 1960, the demand for university education has been on the increase. In order to take care of the increasing demand for university education, the Federal Government of Nigeria then involved private individuals and organization in the provision of university education in Nigeria. Today, there is a total number of 125 (one hundred and twenty five) accredited universities in Nigeria (37 federal, 38 state and 50 private universities (National Universities Commission (NUC, 2014).

Public universities are referred to as those universities owned by the government (state or federal government), and are funded by the government through grants for personnel costs; research funding and capital expenditure (Odebiyi & Aina, 2009). Public universities had a near monopoly in providing university education in Nigeria until 1999 when private individuals and organisations were given license to provide university education (Ajadi, 2010). According to Belfed and Lerin (2003), private universities are non- public or independent universities who do not receive fund from government and are usually administered by denominational or secular boards; including universities operated by individuals for profit. Ndebbio (1983), and Olaniyan (2001) also referred to private universities as those universities that are solely owned, financed and managed by private individuals with the intention to recover cost within a short time and make profit. The need for private universities in Nigeria according to Ajadi (2010) has been enhanced by a number of factors which include; a burgeoning demand from students for access and the inability of the public universities to satisfy the growing social demand for university education; the declining capacity of public universities; the retrenchment of public servants and

incessant strikes by Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU); emphasis on and need for a highly skilled labour force that target the local market; and interest by foreign providers. Okebukola (2004) maintained that the establishment of private universities would go a long way in assisting those who fail to secure admission into public universities.

For the past fifteen years, the Nigeria university education system has been going through series of reforms to increase access and quality and to ensure both internal and external efficiency of the system. Internal efficiency in terms of graduating students at record time, with very few or no drop-out at all and external efficiency in terms of producing what the labour market would absorb on graduation to reduce unemployment to the barest minimum or to totally eliminate unemployment (Ajadi, 2010). These among others according to Ajadi could be responsible for granting of operating license to private universities in Nigeria by the National Universities Commission (NUC). The approval for establishment of private universities by the Federal Government of Nigeria through the NUC gave opportunity to Nigerians who can afford the high cost of education in private universities to attain their educational desires. Initially when some private universities like Babcock University Ilishan-Remo, Madonna University Okija among others took-off; they started with less than 1,000 students based on their carrying capacity. However these days, there seems to be a population explosion in private universities in Nigeria for example, Madonna University alone had enrolment of 2,766 students in 2011/2012 academic year (NUC, 2013). With the increase in intake, the available facilities seem not to be enough and this brings in a lot of vices into the system. Buttressing this, Ajadi (2010) stated that examination malpractice and cultism that were alien in private universities is now gaining ground. He further stated that presently, admission into public universities is highly competitive; most of the students that seek admission into private universities are those who do not meet the public universities' admission standard. The implication of the assertion is that the criteria for admission into most private universities in Nigeria are lower than that of the public universities. This is with a bid to attracting more students since the intention of the private universities at all times is to maximize profit and more students will mean more income which invariably will lead to an increase in profit. This urge is without taking recourse to the issue of quality.

The increase in the demand for university education and the involvement of private individuals in the provision of university education in Nigeria has raised a question at the extent to which quality is being assured in the system. Ensuring that quality education is handed down to the students has thus become one of the central issues accorded priority in the recent educational reform going on worldwide. Quality assurance therefore seems

to have become the mechanism used in achieving quality education. Quality education according to Mosha (1997) is measured by the extent to which the training received from an institution enables the recipient to think clearly, independently and analytically to solve relevant societal problems in any given environment. Assuring quality in the Nigerian university system is therefore indispensable if excellence is required for the human resource base needed to catapult Nigeria into an enviable position it ought to occupy. Quality in education is a multidimensional concept which should embrace all functions and activities: teaching and academic programmes, research and scholarship, staffing, students, building, facilities, equipment, services to the community and academic environment (United Nations Educational Scientific Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 1998). The concern about quality according to Maduewesi (2005) is uppermost in educational discourse all over the world. The stakeholders are conscious to see that educational institutions deliver what they should deliver and that what they deliver, produce desirable outcome, this brought about the concept of quality assurance into the university education system.

Quality assurance is concerned with consistently meeting product specification or getting things right, first time and every time. Quality assurance in the university system implies the ability of the institutions to meet the expectations of the users of manpower in relation to quality of skills acquired by their outputs (Ajayi & Akindutire, 2007). Furthermore, quality assurance in the university education can be said to be the ability of the universities to meet certain criteria relating to academic matters, staff-student ratio, staff mix by rank, staff development, physical facilities, funding and adequate library facilities. The adequacy of various inputs in the university systems in terms of quality and quantity exercises tremendous influence on quality assurance in the university system. According to NUC (2007), quality assurance is a key component of successful internationalization mechanism for building institutional reputation in a competitive local and global arena and necessary foundation for consumer protection. There is therefore the need for arrangements to be made and measures put in place to maintain the degree of excellence of a product or service (Olagboye, 1997).

When it applies to university education, quality assurance means the mechanism by which the university education of a nation ensures that the service it delivers or intends to deliver serve the purpose for which it is intended. Quality assurance focuses on the means by which an educational system ensures that the services it provided remains relevant and appropriate to the needs of the societies. Quality assurance therefore involves series of operational techniques and activities which include all actions taken when requirements for qualities are met. In order to ensure quality in university education system, measures (internal and external) has to be put in place.

These measures whether internal or external are the programmes and policies put in place for ensuring that universities are fulfilling their own purposes as well as maintenance of standards that apply to higher education in general or to the profession or discipline in particular.

Internal quality assurance mechanism refers to the internal policies and measures of a university or programme for ensuring that it is fulfilling its purposes as well as the standards that apply to higher education in general or the profession or discipline in particular (International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), 2006). The development and the utilization of effective internal quality assurance measures are critical to successful university education everywhere in the world (Nigeria inclusive). Every nation and its university graduates are competing in an environment shaped by its own local and national needs as well as international expectations and standards. It is therefore pertinent for the individual universities to assess their own systems in that context and strive to set appropriate standards of their own, which also will draw on and reflect the unique history, needs and expectations of the nation. In the light of this, universities from inception design and implement various internal quality assurance measures to ensure that certain agreed standards of performance are being met. Such measures includes; internal /external examination system, evaluation of students' learning experience; teachers' quality; academic programmes; ensuring quality student intake; quality and availability of facilities; academic calendar and the visitor (Mbakwe & Okeke, 2007). Other internal quality assurance measures include: self assessment, students' evaluation of teaching effectiveness, guidance and counseling services among others. These internal measures for improving and sustaining quality and high standards in the universities though has been set by the federal government of Nigeria, however, the actual implementation are vested in the senate of individual university.

Despite the efforts and the availability of internal measures in Nigeria universities and the external functions of the NUC through the use of Minimum Academic Standard (MAS) document, accreditation and other measures put in place to ensure qualitative university education, both public and private universities in Nigeria seem to have lost their reputation in offering quality university education to the citizenry (Omoregie, 2008). Prior to 1999 there were only 36 universities in Nigeria (25 federal and 11 state owned) and no private university. Today, private universities are more in number than the government owned universities. Bearing in mind the rationale behind the establishment of private universities, one would think that by now, the issue of poor quality university education in Nigeria should have been reduced to the barest minimum. A number of questions then come up regarding this issue; is it that the government and private owned

universities in Nigeria are not keen on employing the internal measures towards ensuring quality in university education? or is it that the nature of ownership of universities is detrimental to their ensuring quality education? It is against this background that the researcher considered it worthwhile to comparatively analyse the internal measures put in place in Nigeria public and private universities in the south-east geopolitical zone of Nigeria towards quality assurance.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Due to the seemingly declining quality in university education in recent years, the accolades attached to Nigerian university education seem to be fading away. Flood of criticisms becloud the admissions procedures as standards for new student intake in Nigerian Universities seem to be lowered. There have been many reported cases of examination malpractice as students' evaluation process do not seem to be standardized; Nigeria Employers Consultative Association ((NECA) 2000) asserted that companies were not recruiting but adopting employment protection strategies due to the very poor quality graduates produced in Nigeria, who do not meet the demands of the industries. NUC (2004) assessment study on the labour market expectations of graduates from Nigerian universities revealed that there were scores of unemployed graduates roaming the streets and more embarrassingly, those who were lucky to secure employment had to undergo remedial training in order to bridge the huge knowledge and skill gaps leftover from university training. This tends to negate the tenets of university which is essentially an institution established to produce quality workforce for national development.

The recent developments in the Nigerian university system and its poor rankings in Africa and the world in general indicate that all is not well as expected with ensuring quality in the Nigeria university system. In as much as one cannot be absolute about the quality implied in the university rankings, it does however show a trend of relative qualities among countries. One may therefore begin to wonder what could be responsible for the state of quality decline in Nigeria Universities. Could it be that individual universities do not in addition or as a follow up of the accreditation by the NUC employ and make adequate use of other internal measures towards ensuring quality in the education they offer? If these trends go on unabated, the Nigeria university education might end up in a mess as regards to ensuring quality education.

It is against this background therefore that one wonders the internal measures that are in place in Nigeria Universities (public and private) towards quality assurance in university education. These and other related problems necessitated this present study on the comparative analysis of the

internal measures used in public and private universities in South-East geopolitical zone of Nigeria for quality assurance.

### **Purpose of the Study**

The main purpose of this study is to comparatively analyse the internal measures for quality assurance in public and private universities in the south-east zone of Nigeria. Specifically, the study compared:

1. Measures of ensuring quality in students' intake used in public and private universities in south-east geopolitical zone for quality assurance
2. Evaluation of students' learning experience measures used in public and private universities in the south-east geopolitical zone for quality assurance
3. Measures of ensuring teacher quality used in public and private universities in the south-east geopolitical zone for quality assurance

### **Research Questions**

The following research questions guided the study:

1. What are the measures used in public and private universities in south-east geopolitical zone to ensure quality in students' intake for quality assurance?
2. What are the evaluation of students' learning experience measures used in public and private universities in south-east geopolitical zone for quality assurance?
3. What are the measures of ensuring teacher quality used in public and private universities in the south-east geopolitical zone for quality assurance?

### **Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance:

1. There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of lecturers in public and private Universities in South East geopolitical zone of Nigeria on the measures used to ensure quality in students' intake for quality assurance.
2. There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of students in public and private Universities in South East geopolitical zone of Nigeria on the measures used in the evaluation of their learning experiences for quality assurance.
3. There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of lecturers in public and private Universities in South East geopolitical zone of Nigeria on the measures used in ensuring teacher quality.



## **Methodology**

### **Research Design**

The study adopted the descriptive survey research design. According to Akuezuilo and Agu (2003), descriptive research design describes and interprets what is; seeks to find out the conditions or relationships that exist, opinions that are held, processes that are going on, effects that are evident or trends that are developing.

### **Population of the Study**

The population of the study consists of 7, 444 lecturers in the 74 faculties and 413 departments and 21,639 third year students admitted in the 2011/2012 academic session in all the 13 Universities (5 public and 8 private) in the south-east geopolitical zone of Nigeria. (Source: Personnel departments and websites of the Universities under study and the Department of Students' Support Services NUC, 2013).

### **Sample and Sampling Techniques**

The sample for this study comprised 2, 106 respondents (936 lecturers and 1, 170 students) sampled from four Universities (two public and two private universities). The sampling was composed through multi-stage. Simple random sampling technique was used in selecting two states out of the five states in the south-east geopolitical zone of Nigeria. Stratified random sampling technique was used to stratify the universities in the two states sampled into public (two public universities) and private (seven private universities). The two public universities in the two states sampled were used for the study, while simple random sampling technique was used to select two universities from the seven private Universities in the two States sampled. Furthermore, simple random sampling technique was used to sample four lecturers and five students each from the 234 departments in the four universities sampled

### **Instrument for Data Collection**

The instrument used for data collection was a questionnaire developed by the researchers, which has two versions; one for the students and the other for the lecturers. The students' questionnaire is titled "Students' Questionnaire on Internal Measures for Quality Assurance" (SQIMFQA). It is divided into two sections namely; Sections: A, B. Section A solicited information on the demographic data of the respondents, while section B solicited information on the measures of evaluation of students' learning experience in universities and it contained 21 items. The students' questionnaire was structured on "Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D) and Strongly Disagree (SD) response pattern.

On the other hand, the lecturers' Questionnaire was titled "Lecturers' Questionnaire on Internal Measures for Quality Assurance" (LQIMFQA). It is divided into three sections namely; Sections: A, B, and C. Section A sought information on the lecturers' demographic data. Section B contains 16 items which focused on student intake measures used in universities for quality assurance. Section C contains 18 items which sought information on the areas of teacher quality measures used for quality assurance in their individual institutions. The lecturers' questionnaire was structured on "strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagree (SD)" response pattern.

### **Validation of the Instrument**

The instrument was subjected to face validation using three experts; two from educational planning and one from measurement and evaluation from the departments of Educational Management and Policy and Educational Foundations all in the Faculty of Education, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.

### **Reliability of the Instrument**

To establish the reliability of the instrument, two universities (one public and one private) in Imo and Abia states which were not part of the sample selected for the study were used. 3<sup>rd</sup> year regular undergraduate students and 300 lecturers (150 from each of the two universities) were randomly sampled. Copies of the questionnaire were administered on them. Cronbach alpha method was used to determine internal consistency of the items. The reliability coefficients for the three sections of the instrument were 0.73, 0.74 and 0.75 respectively, while the overall reliability coefficient of the instrument was 0.74. The instrument was thus considered reliable

### **Method of Data Collection**

Two thousand one hundred and six copies of the questionnaire were administered to the respondents by the researchers with the help of eight research assistants.. On the spot method of data distribution and collection was employed. All the 2,106 copies of the questionnaire that was distributed were properly filled and collected thus recording a return rate of 100%. They were used for data analysis.

### **Method of Data Analysis**

Data relating to the research questions were analyzed using mean, while data on the hypotheses were tested using z-test. Any response with a mean score of 2.50 and above was considered as *agree* while any mean score below 2.50 was not considered as *Disagree*.

## Result

Results were presented in the tables below in accordance with research questions and hypotheses.

Table 1 Lecturers' Responses on the ways of ensuring Quality in Student Intake in Public and Private Universities in South-East Geopolitical Zone of Nigeria for Quality Assurance (N = 936)

S/N	The following are ways universities Ensure Quality in Students' Intake	Public		Private		Total		Decision
		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
1	Subjecting Prospective students to writing post-UTME screening test	3.5504	.54704	2.5675	.49929	3.0589	1.74897	Agree
2	Subjecting prospective direct entry students to writing screening test	2.5474	.60851	2.5256	.52181	2.5365	1.5926 3	Agree
3	Involving lecturers in the construction of the post-UTME questions for prospective students of their department to ensure standardization	1.5094	.62510	1.5128	.52694	1.5111	.57786	Disagree
4	Involving lecturers in the moderation of the post-UTME questions for prospective students of their department to ensure standardization	1.6256	.56286	1.4923	.52704	1.5590	.54907	Disagree
5	Getting all the lecturers in each department involved in the invigilation of the post-UTME	1.4957	.57075	1.4667	.49931	1.4812	.53619	Disagree
6	Provision of other invigilators outside the departmental lecturers	1.5179	.54594	1.4889	.52697	1.5034	.53651	Disagree
7	Provision of adequate examination	1.5111	.60559	1.4564	.53497	1.4838	.57179	Disagree

	hall and sitting arrangement for the post-UTME							
8	Provision of adequate examination materials e.g question papers and answer booklet	1.5231	.64098	1.5419	.54462	1.5325	.59458	Disagree
9	Provision of adequate security agents to ensure that candidates do not engage in examination malpractice	1.5316	.62162	1.4855	.52689	1.5085	.57642	Disagree
10	Checking- in only students with adequate means of identification like photo albums or jamb slip where the students photographs are clear	1.6479	.58734	1.5761	.54090	1.6120	.56550	Disagree
11	Provision of adequate gadgets for re-verification of the prospective students' identity in the examination hall using the internet to identify impersonators	1.4889	.57662	1.5077	.57071	1.4983	.57351	Disagree
12	Preventing the students from entering the examination hall with electronic gadgets like mobile phones and sophisticated calculators	1.5504	.56853	1.4957	.55554	1.5231	.56250	Disagree
13	Ensuring that only candidates with five credits in five subjects to include English and mathematics are allowed to participate in the post-UTME screening test	1.4786	.60532	1.5197	.63303	1.4991	.61940	Disagree

14	Meeting the admission requirements peculiar to the proposed course of study	1.5299	.53910	1.5060	.58846	1.5179	.56420	Disagree
15	Verification of the prospective student's O'level and JAMB results to ensure authenticity	1.5744	.53478	1.5470	.55046	1.5607	.54262	Disagree
16	Admitting students based on merit having performed well in the UTME and post-UTME	2.5991	.58849	2.5077	.54931	2..553 4	1.5979 3	Agree
17	Giving admission to students based on catchment areas	2.6615	.51182	1.5197	.54274	2.0906	1.4458 9	Disagree
18	Admitting students based on their coming from States considered as educationally backward or disadvantaged.	2.5966	.58928	1.5214	.56433	2.0590	1.4349 2	Disagree
19	Admitting students based on university discretion	2.5709	.62388	1.4923	.54931	2.0314	1.4253 4	Disagree
20	Admitting students based on payment of an endowment fee by the prospective students	1.5624	.63835	1.5333	.56374	1.5479	.60212	Disagree
	<b>Grand mean</b>					<b>1.8824</b>		<b>Disagree</b>

Table 1 above reveals that all the items except 1 and 2 had mean scores below the cut off point of 2.50. Thus revealing that the respondents agreed that public and private universities in the south- east geopolitical zone of Nigeria conduct post-UTME for their prospective students. However, the table revealed that public universities admits students based on their coming from educationally disadvantaged states, catchment areas and using university discretion while the reverse was the case with private universities. Furthermore, result from item 20 revealed that both public and private universities do not admit students based on their payment of endowment fee. Furthermore, the table revealed that the grand mean is 1.88 and this is far below the benchmark of 2.50. This indicates that various measures of ensuring quality in students' intake is not adequately employed in public and

private universities in the south-east geopolitical zone of Nigeria as an internal measure for quality assurance.

Table 2 Students' Responses on the Measures used in the Evaluation of Students' Learning Experiences in Public and Private Universities in South-East Geopolitical Zone of Nigeria for Quality Assurance (N = 1,170)

S/N	Measures of Evaluating Students' Learning Experiences for Quality Assurance	Public		Private		Total		Decision
		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
21	Communicating assessment criteria to the students at the beginning of each course	1.5769	.58209	1.5919	.59088	1.5844	.58623	Disagree
22	Assessment requirement and marking criteria being made clear to the students at the beginning of each course	1.6111	.57653	1.6175	.58631	1.6143	.58114	Disagree
23	Spreading assessment of students' learning appropriately across semester rather than being concentrated at the end of each course	1.4786	.60827	1.4103	.60198	1.4444	.60578	Disagree
24a	Psychomotor domain,	1.4829	.56459	1.5491	.57401	1.5160	.56998	Disagree
25b	Cognitive domain,	2.5620	.54203	2.5406	.51160	2.5513	.52686	Agree
26c	Affective domain.	1.5171	.56459	1.5000	.53366	1.5085	.54912	Disagree
27	Provisions of students evaluation of learning experience to emphasize coverage of course content	1.7201	.52011	1.6560	.51031	1.6880	.51596	Disagree
28	Evaluation of students' learning experience based on the students' mental age	1.5812	.55513	1.5662	.53356	1.5737	.54421	Disagree
29	Evaluation of	1.5812	.58150	1.5342	.54449	1.5577	.56349	Disagree

	students" learning experience based on the students" chronological age							
30	Involving the students in the planning process of their evaluation of learning experience	1.4188	.55897	1.4466	.53098	1.4327	.54504	Disagree
31	Administration of take home assignments to students	1.4893	.56475	1.4380	.53005	1.4637	.54798	Disagree
32	Administration of tests or quizzes to students	1.6538	.52338	1.6261	.51853	1.6400	.52086	Disagree
33	Administration of group assignments to students	1.5427	.56323	1.5321	.53270	1.5374	.54791	Disagree
34	Appropriate match between the learning objectives and various assessment techniques	1.4615	.56354	1.5128	.53351	1.4872	.54904	Disagree
35	Provision of immediate feedback on assessment given to students	1.4786	.54906	1.4936	.53362	1.4861	.54116	Disagree
36	Discussion with the students following feedback from their assessment of learning.	1.5684	.54126	1.5449	.53177	1.5566	.53638	Disagree
37	Making provision for students to peer evaluation their learning experiences	1.4444	.57714	1.4017	.56005	1.4231	.56876	Disagree
38	Making provision for students to evaluate their own learning experiences (self evaluation)	1.6303	.52973	1.5962	.52491	1.6132	.52732	Disagree
39	Revision of continuous assessment (take home	1.5107	.54937	1.5299	.53282	1.5203	.54096	Disagree

	assignments, quizzes, etc) before the final examination							
40	Adequate provision of invigilators that helps lecturers to invigilate their exams	1.5299	.53282	1.5150	.53345	1.5224	.53291	Disagree
41	Adequate provision of examination halls and sitting arrangements for students' evaluation	1.6410	.51465	1.6432	.51406	1.6421	.51408	Disagree
42	Adequate provision of examination materials (e.g. question papers and answer scripts)	1.5620	.53005	1.5726	.54856	1.5673	.53912	Disagree
43	Provisions of means of identification like photo cards used to check in the students into the examination hall	1.5620	.53005	1.5620	.57276	1.5620	.55152	Disagree
	<b>Grand mean</b>					<b>1.5385</b>		<b>Disagree</b>

Table 2 above reveals that only item 25b had a mean score of 2.55 which indicates that the students agreed that they are being evaluated in the cognitive domain. All the other items had mean scores below the cutoff point of 2.50. Thus depicting those students in public and private universities in south-east geopolitical zone of Nigeria disagreed that those measures were used in the evaluation of their learning experiences. Furthermore, the table revealed that the grand mean is 1.54 and this is far below the benchmark of 2.50. This implies that measures of ensuring quality in the evaluation of students' learning experience is not adequately used in public and private universities in the south-east geopolitical zone of Nigeria as an internal measure for quality assurance.



Table 3 Lecturers' Responses on the Measures of ensuring Teachers' Quality used in Public and Private Universities in South-East Geopolitical Zone of Nigeria for Quality Assurance (N = 936)

S/N	Ways of Ensuring Teacher Quality in Universities	Public		Private		Total		Decision
		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
44	Subjecting lecturers to oral interview before their appointment as lecturers	1.4744	.53305	1.4637	.56368	1.4690	.54831	Disagree
45	Subjecting lecturers to written interview before appointing them as lecturers	1.6282	.51800	1.6432	.55415	1.6357	.53615	Disagree
46	Orientation of lecturers regarding their job on their appointment as lecturers	1.5128	.53351	1.5556	.56968	1.5342	.55201	Disagree
47	Encouragement of lecturers to carry out researches	1.4252	.52839	1.6624	.51250	1.5438	.53358	Disagree
48	Giving research grants to lecturers to carry out researches	1.4466	.53098	1.5150	.52942	1.4808	.53102	Disagree
49	Encouraging lecturers to attend conferences, both local and international	1.5641	.57626	1.5748	.58603	1.5694	.58088	Disagree
50	Sponsoring lecturers financially to attend conferences	1.5085	.63611	1.4936	.65928	1.5011	.64750	Disagree
51	Always Organizing workshops for lecturers professional growth and development	1.6368	.61084	1.6752	.63217	1.6560	.62156	Disagree
52	Encouraging lecturers to be publishing papers	1.5192	.62911	1.5598	.65331	1.5395	.64130	Disagree
53	Always supporting lecturers	1.5705	.61507	1.5620	.63314	1.5662	.62385	Disagree

	financially for their publications							
54	Provisions for in service (raining of lecturers	1.5171	.62576	1.5128	.62586	1.5150	.62548	Disagree
55	Provisions for and sponsoring lecturers to attend staff development programme abroad	1.6111	.63654	1.6175	.63539	1.6143	.63563	Disagree
56	Creation of an awareness and avenue for mentorship	1.5812	.62069	1.5662	.62247	1.5737	.62129	Disagree
57	Creation of an avenue for peer review of teaching effectiveness	1.6496	.60073	1.6325	.60474	1.6410	.60248	Disagree
58	Making Provisions for students evaluation of lecturers' teaching effectiveness	1.5085	.62593	1.5192	.62569	1.5139	.62550	Disagree
59	Analyzing and communicating the outcome of students evaluation of teaching effectiveness to lecturers	1.5855	.62011	1.5897	.61951	1.5876	.61948	Disagree
60	Using the outcome of Students evaluation of teaching effectiveness for formative purposes	1.5150	.61546	1.5214	.61527	1.5182	.61504	Disagree
61	Using the outcome of Students evaluation of teaching effectiveness for summative purposes	1.5299	.64880	1.5299	.63882	1.5299	.64349	Disagree
	<b>Grand mean</b>					<b>1.5550</b>		<b>Disagree</b>

Table 3 above reveals that all the items had mean scores below the cutoff point of 2.50. Thus revealed that the respondents disagreed that the measures were used in ensuring teacher quality in public and private universities in south-east geopolitical zone of Nigeria. Furthermore, the table revealed that

the grand mean is 1.56 and this is far below the benchmark of 2.50. This implies that measures of ensuring teacher quality are not adequately used in public and private universities in the south-east geopolitical zone of Nigeria as an internal measure for quality assurance.

Table 4 z-test Comparison of the Mean Ratings of Lecturers on the Measures used by Public and Private Universities in South-east Geopolitical Zone of Nigeria to ensure Quality in Students' intake for Quality Assurance.

	University type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t-tab.	t-cal	.	Decision
Student intake measures	Private	468	1.7082	.17429	934	1.96	3.615		Reject
	Public	468	1.5462	.18464					

$P < 0.05$

Result from Table 4 above shows that the calculated t-value (3.62) is greater than the critical t-value (1.96) at 0.05 level of significance; therefore the null hypothesis was not accepted. Thus there is a significant difference in the measures used in public and private universities in the south-east geopolitical zone of Nigeria to ensure quality of students' intake for quality assurance. Public universities used more measures to ensure quality in students' intake than private universities.

Table 5 z-test Comparison of the Mean Ratings of the Students on the Evaluation of Students Learning Experience Measures used in Public and Private Universities in South-east Geopolitical Zone of Nigeria for Quality Assurance.

	University type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df.	t-tab.	t-cal		Decision
Student evaluation measures	Private	585	1.5346	.16018	1168	1.96	0.755		Accept
	Public	585	1.5425	.15866					

$P < 0.05$

Result from Table 5 indicates that the calculated t-value (0.755) is less than the critical t-value (1.96) at 0.05 level of significance; therefore the null hypothesis is accepted. Thus there is no significant difference in the mean ratings of respondents on the evaluation of students' learning experience measures used in public and private universities in south-east geopolitical zone for quality assurance.

Table 6 z-test Comparison of the Mean Ratings of Lecturers on the Measures of ensuring Teacher Quality used in Public and Private Universities in South-east Geopolitical Zone of Nigeria for Quality Assurance.

	University type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t-tab.	t-cal		Decision
Teacher quality measures	Private	468	1.5436	.21600	934	1.96	1.642		Accept
	Public	468	1.5664	.20868					

$P < 0.05$

Result from Table 6 above shows that the calculated t-value (1.64) is less than the critical t-value (1.96) at 0.05 level of significance; therefore the null hypothesis is accepted. Thus there is no significant difference in the mean ratings of respondents on the measures of ensuring teacher quality used in public and private universities in south-east geopolitical zone for quality assurance.

## Discussion

The findings of the study presented in Table 1 revealed that the public and private universities in the south-east geopolitical zone of Nigeria do not adequately employ measures towards ensuring quality in students' intake for quality assurance purposes. The study also reveals in table 4 that public universities employ more measures towards ensuring quality in the students' intake than the private universities. Furthermore, the difference is found to be significant. This finding is in line with Awe and Ajadi (2010) who found out in their study that academic staff perceived that there were quality assurance measures for academic programmes in Nigeria universities in the areas of admission requirements. Their study further revealed that there are deficiencies in the quality assurance measures most especially as it concerns students' intake processes.

Adebayo, Oyenike & Adesoji, (2009) and Mbakwem and Okeke, (2007) maintained that to further ensure the quality of student intake, that the POST-JAMB screening tests of potential students have been put in place by various universities. Anetekhar (2004) also posited that the POST-JAMB policy will prevent morally bankrupt students from gaining admissions since the score they bring in for admission is not a true reflection of their intellect. The above is in line with the findings of the study as the universities from the findings conduct post-UTME screening test for their prospective students, but however fails to adopt measures towards ensuring standardization and objectivity of the post-UTME examination as was revealed in the study.

One of the objectives of university education in Nigeria and consequent granting of operational license to private universities is to provide qualitative university education to the citizens. One of the ways to ensure this is to ensure quality in the students' intake process. The findings of this study on the contrary revealed that both the public and private universities do not adequately employ measures to ensure quality in the students' intake for quality assurance. One possible reason for this could be as a result of the aim of any private establishment (private universities inclusive) whose intention at all times is to maximize profit. Private universities may have lowered their admission requirements and processes with a bid to attracting more students. Since more students will mean more income which invariably will lead to an increase in profit which most times

can be at the detriment of quality of education it offers. This may not be the case with public universities as they are not profit-oriented institution. Another factor that could be responsible for the inadequate employing of measures towards ensuring quality in the students' intake the researcher conceived is inadequate fund available to the universities to procure the necessary facilities that can facilitate standardization in the post-UTME examination in the universities. Other factors could be inadequate resource persons that can operate ICT facilities which can be used to ensuring that standards are met in the administration of the post- UTME examinations. This inadequate employment of measures towards ensuring quality of student intake could be detrimental towards ensuring quality assurance in the university education system. Mbakwem and Okeke (2007) in corroboration rightly stated that a crucial factor in attaining high quality assurance graduates is the quality of students admitted into the university in the first instance. Thus there is an intricate relationship between quality of student intake and quality of graduate output.

The findings of the study as shown on Table 2 revealed that public and private universities in the south east geopolitical zone do not adequately employ measures of ensuring quality in the evaluation of the students learning experience as an internal measure for quality assurance. Furthermore, the result on table 9 indicated that public universities employ more measures towards ensuring quality in the evaluation of students learning experience than the private universities. However, the difference is not significant. The finding is not in corroboration with Ajuonuma (2007) who maintained that Evaluation of students' learning experience in Nigerian universities is made up of continuous assessment and end of semester examinations in the three educational domains (cognitive, affective and psychomotor), which account for 30 percent and 70 percent of the total score respectively. The study revealed that evaluation of students learning experiences is carried out mainly in the cognitive domain at the detriment of the other domains (affective and psychomotor) of learning. However, majority of the goals of university education as stated in the National Policy on Education (2009) is affective in nature, others are cognitive and psychomotor. Where cognitive education domain is not carried out jointly with the affective and psychomotor domains, a great imbalance results (Nwanna, 2004). The study reveals that students are not adequately administered continuous assessment in terms of quizzes, take home assignment among others

The importance of evaluation of students learning experiences at the university level stems from the fact that it is an indispensable tool for determining educational outcomes for the purpose of maintenance of standard, promotion, certification, placement, improvement, increased

productivity, accountability, quality control among others. In order to ensure that the above objectives are achieved, there is the need to ensure quality via employing various mechanisms in the evaluation of students' learning experience measures at the university. However, the findings of this study revealed that the measures of ensuring quality in the evaluation of students' learning experience for quality assurance were not adequately employed. Inadequate employment of measures towards ensuring quality in the evaluation of students learning experience towards quality assurance in public and private universities in the south-east could be as a result of so many factors. The researcher is of the view that one of the reasons could be that majority of the lecturers do not possess the necessary knowledge and skills in terms of test construction, utilization and administering and in the use of non-cognitive techniques of evaluation. The university management may also have failed to organize and or sponsor lecturers to attend seminars and workshops where they will be taught those skills. Lecturers also may not have fully appreciated the philosophy and techniques of continuous assessment as they may tend to consider time spent on continuous assessment as time wasted. Lecturers may thus have continuously show lackadaisical formative assessment of their students.

The findings of this study as shown on table 3 reveals that public and private universities in the south-east geopolitical zone of Nigeria do not employ adequate measures towards ensuring quality of teachers for quality assurance. The study further revealed that public universities slightly employ more measures towards ensuring quality of teachers than the private universities. However, the difference is not significant. The finding of this study is in line with Okagbare (2012) who found out among others that most lecturers are not adequately trained on computer usage towards enhancing their professional growth. The finding is further in corroboration with Awe and Ajadi (2010) who found out that quality of academic staff is a quality assurance measures for academic programmes in universities and that there are deficiencies in the quality of academic staff in Nigeria universities.

High teacher quality should produce corresponding high student quality thus enhancing quality assurance. Since no educational system could rise beyond the level of teachers who transmit knowledge to the students. Excellence in educational outcomes especially in universities demands that quality academic staff are recruited and properly developed to perform their roles in the areas of teaching, research and administrative task. It has been established that regular professional development of members of academic staff is important to maintaining a high quality of service provision. In a situation such as the findings of this study that measures towards ensuring quality of lecturers in the universities were not adequately employed one may wonder the quality of education expected from such an institution.

Various arguments could be raised to account for why the institutions do not adequately employ measures towards ensuring quality of their teachers. One possible explanation could be as a result of the porous nature through which some lecturers are absorbed into the universities most especially the private universities, being a private business. Another possible explanation could be inadequate fund to organize workshops, conferences and seminars geared towards facilitating lecturers' professional growth and development. There may also be dearth of research grants in these institutions. Furthermore, in as much that the difference is not significant, the reason why public universities employs more measures (though not adequate) than the private universities could be as a result of excess supply of lecturers to the public universities. The rate at which lecturers' demand to be employed in public universities than in private universities perhaps as a result high job security, fringe benefits and allowances, better and improved conditions of service enjoyed by academics in the public universities. Furthermore, as a result of the existence of strong unions like the Academic Staff Union of Universities who constantly demands and agitate for better and improved conditions of service and welfare of its members. This may not be obtainable in the private universities since it's a private business. This perhaps may lead to getting an appointment into the public universities very competitive. This as a consequence will lead to rigorous processes and ensuring quality to an extent in the recruitment process of lecturers into the public universities.

### **Conclusion**

An inference that is drawn from the findings of this study is that both public and private universities in the south-east geopolitical zone of Nigeria do not adequately use internal measures (students' evaluation of teaching effectiveness, guidance and counseling services, quality student intake, evaluation of students' learning experience and teacher quality) towards quality assurance. Therefore one can conclude that the inadequate use of these internal measures towards achieving quality assurance in the universities to a great extent could be responsible for the sharp and continuous decline in the quality of university education in the south-east zone of Nigeria and the consequent low ratings of universities in the south-east geopolitical zone of Nigeria among the comity of universities in the world, Africa and in Nigeria in the web metric university rankings.

### **Recommendations**

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations were made:

1. Information Communication Technology (ICT) should be adequately employed by public and private universities in the south-east geopolitical zone in the admission process of their prospective students. This will introduce greater safety, security and efficiency in the process most especially in the post-UTME exercise.
2. University Managements in the south-east geopolitical zone should make adequate provision of security personnel and law enforcement agencies such as the Police, Civil Defense among others during their post-UTME screening exercise. As their presence will help to maintain order and help to checkmate examination malpractice.
3. Series of workshops and seminars should be organized by the University Managements for lecturers on test construction techniques and other assessment procedures to ensure qualitative evaluation of overall abilities of the students most especially in the use of non-cognitive techniques of evaluation.
4. Academic planning and control units of the universities should articulate all the goals of the university education with the strategies for the assessment prepared by experts and circulated to all academic staff of the university for implementation.
5. Adequate preparation of examination halls ahead of time, to ensure that there are enough seats, good ventilation, enough question papers, answer scripts, enough honest and dedicated invigilators outside the course lecturers.
6. The NUC benchmarks (if any) on recruitment of lecturers should be made compulsory to be adopted by both the public and private universities in the recruitment process of lecturers in order to ensure quality of lecturers' intake.
7. The government and the university Management should adopt instructional development for academic staff in form of in-service training and re-orientate them in order to be able to cope with the changing and challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the era of ICT.
8. Lecturers who have sufficient knowledge of test construction mechanisms should be employed to teach in the universities. Lecturers who are already in the university system that do not have the required knowledge should be exposed to workshops where they will be trained and retrained to enable them acquire necessary knowledge, skills and pedagogy of teaching and learning and also in the evaluation of students' learning experience with regards to test construction and utilization and in the use of non-cognitive techniques of evaluation.



## References:

- Adebayo, O., Oyenike, A. & Adesoji, S. (2009). *Quality assurance and sustainable university education in Nigeria*. Retrieved from <http://aadice.hiroshima-u.ac.jp>
- Ajadi, T. O. (2010). Private universities in Nigeria- the challenges ahead. *American journal of scientific research* 7, 15-24
- Ajayi, I. A. & Akindutire, I. O. (2007). The unresolved issues of quality assurance in Nigerian universities. *Journal of Sociology and Education in Africa*, 6(1),43-50
- Ajuonuma, J. O. (2007). Strategies for quality assurance in the assessment of students' academic performance in Nigerian universities. In J. B. Babalola; G. O. Akpa; A . O. Ayeni, & S. O. Adediji, (Eds.). *Access, Equity and Quality in Higher Education* (255-262). Lagos: Awemark industrial printers
- Akuezuilo, E. O., & Agu, N. (2003). *Research and statistics in education and social sciences: methods and application*. Awka: Nuel centi Publishers and Academic press ltd.
- Awe, A. B. & Ajadi,T. O. (2010). Academic staff perception of quality assurance in Nigerian public universities. *Journal of Nigerian Academy of Education* 6 (1), 161-172
- Biswalo, (1996). *An introduction to guidance and counselling diverse Africa contexts*. Dare Salaam: Dare salaam University Press.
- Braskamp, L. A., & Ory, J. C. (1994). *Assessing faculty work: enhancing individual and instructional performance*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
- Fadokun, J. B. (2005, September). Educational assessment and quality assurance implication for principal instructional leadership roles. *Paper presented at the 31st Annual Conference of International Association for Educational Assessment*, Abuja.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (2009): *National policy on education*. Lagos: NERDC Press.
- Ibukun, W. O. (1997): *Educational management: theory and practice*. Ado-Ekiti: Green Line Publishers.
- Igborgbor, G. C. (2012). Quality assurance for national development in Africa. *Research in education* 18 (1), 1-5.
- IIEP (2006). *Making basic choices for external quality assurance system*. Paris: IIEP Publications.
- Iyamu, E. O. S. & Aduwa, J. (2005). *Assessment of the inquiry-teaching competences of social studies teachers in junior secondary schools in Edo State*. university of Benin: Benin.
- Maduwesi, E. J. (2005). *Benchmarks and global trends in education*. Benin: Dasyilva influence Enterprises.
- Mbakwem, J. N. & Okeke, F. N. (2007). Enhancing internal and external quality assurance mechanisms in Nigerian universities through ICT

- compliance. In J. B Babalola; G. O. Akpa, A. O Ayeni & S. O. Adedeji (Eds.). *Access, equity and quality in higher education* (307-315). Lagos: Awemark publications.
- Mosha, P. (1997). *Educational system administration in Nigeria structure, responsibilities and practices* lagos : Tison press.
- Nguyen, T. N. (2012). *Internal quality assurance in Vietnam's higher education* (Master's thesis). University of Twente, Netherlands.
- NUC (2004, June 9). Appraisal of higher education policy options. *The comet*. Pp. 26.
- Nwana, O. C. (2004). Minimum standards and accountability in the Nigerian educational sytem in B. A. Eheazu & U. M. O. Ivowi (Eds.). *Minimum standards and accountability in the Nigerian education system*. Lead paper presented at the 18<sup>th</sup> Annual Congress of the Nigeria Academy of Education. Port-Harcourt, Mercury International.
- Odebiyi, A. I., & Aina, O. I. (2009). Alternative modes of financing higher education in Nigeria and implications for university governance. final Report. Accra: *Association of African universities*. Retrieved from <http://www.aau.org/studyprogram/notpub/odebaina.pdf>
- Okebukola, P. (2004, April). Quality assurance in teacher education: the role of faculties of education in Nigerian universities. *A paper delivered at a meeting of Committee of Deans of education in Nigerian universities*, held at the faculty of education, university of Ilorin, Kwara state.
- Olagboye, A. A. (1997). *Educational system administration in Nigeria structure, responsibilities and practices*. Lagos: Tison Press.
- Omoni, G. I. (2012). Enhancing quality assurance through counseling services in secondary schools. *Research in education* 18 (1), 6-13.
- Omoriege, A. (2008). Quality assurance in Nigerian university education and credentialing. *A paper presented at the first annual conference of the faculty of education, Ambrose Ali University Ekpoma*.
- UNESCO (1998). *Higher education in the 21st century: vision and mission World declaration higher education for the 21st century and framework for priority action for change and development in higher education*. Paris: UNESCO